

3-11-03 – Preferred Alternative Meeting Notes

Present: Jean Nelson-Dean, Lisa Clark, Mollie CHaudet, Bill Dean, Ryan Franklin, Ed Faulkner, Keith Brown, Russ Frost, Bob Davison, Ron Gregory, Greg Currie, Steve Castillo, Teal Purrington, Michelle McSwain, Brian Ferry, Catherine Morrow, Joanie DuFourd, Dick DuFourd, Jerry Cordova, Glen Ardt, Bill McCaffrey, Robert Towne, Phil Paterno, Bill Fockler, Martin Winch, Nancy Gilbert

Welcome/Introductions

JND goes over agenda, directs introductions

MC – What we've done since the last meeting, and where do we go from here.

Pleased w/results of last mtg, lots to work with. We were able to get a sense of where we had to work, and what we'd need to bring back to the group. We feel like we addressed Military, transportation corridor/Redmond, designated trails, and had good agreement for these areas. Then we found areas that needed changes – see draft changes that the BLM worked on over the last week. This is where we need group input

Big 4 Major categories to work on:

Recreation/wildlife/aesthetics (Mar 11);

Economic Viability/Contribution/Grazing/Minerals (Mar 17);

Lands/community expansion/Z-2 designation (Mar 11);

Ecosystem Health/OG JUOC, shrub steppe/Veg mgmt priorities (Mar 17).

Some issues (hydro, soils, roads/trails) not addressed – need to look at overall issues first, then fine tuning, dealing with S&Gs etc.

Bob D – consider option of considering military while we deal with ecosystem

Joanie – let's not add to schedule right now, put military at the end, since it's less of a conflict

ID team has resolved some of the issues taken off the table, and we didn't get it all written up, but we'll get it to you so you can get a sense of what we've taken off the table.

JND – process review: the large group wants to deal with the issues, and we would like to begin dealing with conflicts and getting to specifics.

BLM: Propose that w/in large group we take a few moments to brainstorm options, and specifically, if you disagree w/an aspect of an option, then propose something else that meets yours and another interest. Speak to what it doesn't meet, as well as provide an alternate that does meet your interest. Then reps at the center table, bring out/express ideas of the larger group.

Tackle Rec/Wild and Lands today. Bill D/Greg will present what BLM has worked on so far, and then the group will take it from there.

BD/GC present the IDT options –

Maps now show options for rec emphasis, seasonal use periods, travel mgmt

See options table for description of changes, options to Alt 6 based on conflicts brought out by interest groups.

Questions:

Add close to motorized north of Hwy 126, next to canal in “improve rec opps” common to all.

Have we addressed cumulative impacts with added rec from USFS, etc.?

Look at it somewhat in alt development, but we’ll address it in the analysis. For now, we haven’t identified an actual link between BLM/USFS roads/trails.

Agreement with other members – hard to see the big picture for conflicts right now.

MC – asking the group to give it the best shot to find a balance of uses in different areas. Won’t have affects analysis until the draft – there will still be opps for changes, etc.

Note to all: maps from AMS etc have changed with new information for wildlife and other issue areas.

Brainstorming session, possible modifications of options

Develop options that relies more on seasonal restrictions rather than reducing road and trail density.

Substitute snow closure for seasonal closures.

Concern about leakage from areas that are open to areas that are closed.

Concern about not knowing use levels when developing options.

Low conflict areas, close seasonally. Allow use in high conflict areas.

Keep area w/ of canal/n of 126 limited to roads and trails.

Close smith canyon/dry canyon open area n of 126 and w of canal, and into Steamboat rock

If military use would be permitted in Steamboat rock should avoid different standards for public.

La Pine provide wildlife corridors and have them comply w/ S. County plan.

Small option resolution team.

Key locations wl vs recreation

Health of wildlife habitat

S. of juniper acres. whatever roads are not designated, no rights of way. 1 road running n/s, fragments w/l habitat

Highway change seasonal closure to Dec 1 thru July 15.

Proposed reduction in trails would reduce fragmentation and create larger blocks of habitat

- Lack of urban interface opportunities

- No 4 wheel drive opportunities

- Insufficient winter opportunities.

Need to understand user needs

- urban interface—short duration rides

- winter opportunities—long duration, out of area users need large trail network 10

- +plus miles

Existing trail system not designed should redesign trail system.

Need to avoid fragmentation of wl habitat.

Benefits and costs of Seasonal closures?

Seasonal closures reduces disturbance during closures can notify public

Road density currently higher than trails.

Many roads seldom used.

Seasonal closure not flexible.

Seasonal closure in Millican area is accompanying expansion of trails in millican plateau

Need to set standards to meet needs of wl and motorized recreation

Motorized users have already lost opportunities over the years. Cutting use may not meet economic goals.

Lunch

Comments by non core participants

- Look to East Fort Rock process for example of cooperative planning and trust.

Point of consensus- need for redesigned designated trail system. Issue is when is it useable. When is it needed?

Develop set of standards

Objectives

- Provide effective wildlife habitat

Large unfragmented blocks

Focus on areas with intact shrub steppe

Avoid known important sites (nests, calving areas)

Trails should be located across a range of topographic areas

Rec. Objectives

Loops

Safety

Stand alone systems on both sides of Westbutte Rd.

Varieties of experience

Staging areas provide access to multiple trails

Locate trails away from social conflict.

Provide opportunities when needed

Proposal

Reduce fragmentation through trail design

If not utilize seasonal closure.

Needs fragmentation standard

Two proposals

1. Develop fragmentation standard as basis for determining trail development levels.

Seasonal closure 3-31 to 9-15 grouse benefit

need earlier closure to protect big game

2..Develop and meet fragmentation standards

If not impose seasonal closures

Ron W and Phil P presented BLM options for land ownership

Concern about extensive changes from alt. 6

Changing from community expansion to z-2—communities lose control, but blm loses ability to mitigate for loss of land, phil says not necessarily

Changing from z-1 to Z-2

500 ft buffer

Needs

Community Control over type of growth

Recovery of natural resource values (mitigation for habitat loss)

Costs/mitigation (Z-2-community expansion)

Not necessarily related.

Greatest \$ value for lands as well as cooperation w/city and county

Differences between public purposes and other uses that benefit individual.

Questions

See flip chart

Does Z-2 ensure ...
Compatibility ...
What percentage ...

Sawtooth remains community expansion, N. of 126 w/o open space, (discuss buffer later)
Maintain Alt 6 CE lands, put other “unnecessary” ce into z-2.

Next meeting
Monday March 17,
Lands 8:30
Everybody 9:00

NOTE: Wildlife Species Habitat Maps should be available on the BLM website by
Friday, March 14.

Flip Charts from the Meeting

1. Order of Discussion Issues:

March 11:

Recreation/Wildlife/Aesthetics (Recreation emphasis, wildlife emphasis)
Lands (Community Expansion, Z-2 designations)

March 17:

Economic Viability/Contribution (Grazing, minerals)
Ecosystem Health (Old-growth juniper, veg management priorities)

2. Health of Wildlife Issues (from issues table)

Sage grouse:

Regarding roads in the peninsula (from CTA option choices)

- close roads to avoid fragmentation
- keep some roads open for private land access
- closed roads still allows administrative access (fire, etc.)
- Leaves the option to designate where the roads go.

From Option 1:

- Seasonal closure is 12/1-9/15 → would be OK to change this to 12/1 – 7/15
- Re: North Millican – what kind of road and trail decrease would be involved?
 - Take existing low areas to make blocks
 - Use trails next to roads
 - Make trails open to counter areas with too much dust, too soft, etc.
 - Need enough miles (150+) to meet multi-day user needs.
 - Trails should be designed to decrease fragmentation

3. Seasonal closures – for wintering, migrating, breeding, nesting, etc.

- A method for dealing with fragmentation by eliminating users at key times
- Shotgun approach with potentially less flexibility
- Doesn't allow for yearly changes for things like snow/no snow
- Geo-specific closures require a lot of on-the-ground knowledge
- Seasonal closures are easier to enforce because people should either be there, or not
- May not always be all-inclusive

Seasonal (points above) vs. Designations by user volume/road density

- Decreasing/increasing miles allows more flexibility
- Density should be impact/area specific
- Can be specific to use, size of area, amount of use, season, etc.
- May have more user-created trails off urban areas (until an effective system is actually designed)

Need an overall balance of use – maybe expand the Plateau, plus decrease miles elsewhere. Need to still have enough consecutive miles to meet multi-day use need (150+). May look at increasing trail density, while decreasing road density, or expanding the Millican Plateau.

4. Trail Design

Trail design is the key to user satisfaction and increases compliance.

Right now, the trail system in Millican area does not meet user OR wildlife needs.

Use is being pushed into N. Plateau and leads to a bottleneck. Now we're having to compromise to allow for use, where a lot of compromise has already been done.

KEY: NEED TO TRUST EACH OTHER TO DESIGN, IMPLEMENT, AND MAINTAIN A SYSTEM APPROPRIATE TO BOTH ARGUMENTS

Habitat Effectiveness	User Satisfaction and Compliance
<p>Large, unfragmented blocks</p> <p>Protect known resources</p> <p>Connectivity between large blocks</p> <p>Protect existing habitat like shrub-steppe</p>	<p>Provide a variety of trail types (Loops, easy → technical) and locations, like both sides of West Butte Rd.</p> <p>Provide high quality dispersed recreation opps.</p> <p>Provide adequate staging areas (size, location) with multiple outlets for fast dispersal</p> <p>Provide a lot of trail junctions for more choice, increases dispersal</p> <p>Locate trails away from areas with social conflicts, like subdivisions.</p> <p>Provide opportunities during different seasons to meet year-round demand</p> <p>Maximize management flexibility to respond to changing conditions (fire, wildlife species, etc.)</p> <p>More trails increases flexibility</p>

5. OPTION SUGGESTIONS:

Can we get to an option that meets closure and fragmentation needs → like a seasonal closure? If we can't meet 70 percent effectiveness or if habitat effectiveness falls below a certain type of trail experience? (Works on large areas, maybe not south Millican).

Look to Road density/trail design first, then seasonal closures (12/1-7/31) – Seasonal closures should respond to specific conditions and need (maybe 3/15 -9/15).

6. Setting Standards or Objectives/guidelines for motorized recreation/wildlife mgmt:

For example: North Millican –

- Try to achieve 70 percent habitat effectiveness for elk by maintaining large blocks of land, arranged according to natural spots on the landscape (topography, etc.)

- Have a seasonal closure between 3/15 – 9/15
- Hard to drive at using road density
- 70% habitat effectiveness looks at reducing fragmentation
 - large, unfragmented blocks of land
 - know sensitive nest sites
 - diversity of landform types are protected and reserved
 - connectivity between large/unfragmented blocks
 - Pay particular attention to blocks of shrub-steppe

7. Fragmentation Standard Option Suggestion:

In North Millican, try to reach the fragmentation standard (70% hab effectiveness for elk). If met through road/trail density/design no seasonal closure would be necessary. If not, then seasonal closures would be made/maintained. Examples are 12/1 – 7/31 (S. Millican); 3/15 – 9/15 (N. Millican); 12/1 – 4/30 (N. Millican).

Frag standard can vary by area - North Millican (70 %), Millican Plateau (50%), etc.

8. Suggestions:

- Perhaps look at ranges for indicators of acceptable change – might allow for greater flexibility
- Look at proposals for other areas – provide feedback to the larger group on other issues.
- Provide smaller group with better data.

9. Brainstorming options

- Is there an option that looks more at seasonal restrictions rather than decreasing roads and trail densities? (Millican/N. Millican) And allows more trail options seasonally and provides for wildlife?
- Would a snow closure help increase wildlife habitat while providing for year-round recreation needs (N. Millican).
- (Concern) Road and trail density reductions fit with landforms – to help with future user-created trails in newly non-motorized areas/decreased density areas.
- Where areas of low wildlife conflict occur, have a seasonal closure; where high conflict areas occur, have these areas open to balance use. Use public education to inform people about these trade-offs.
- Leave west of canal open to motorized – already used, future community expansion area, so OK to use right now (open in exist alternative 6).
- Switch Dry/Smith canyons back to non-motorized, and areas with decreased wildlife conflicts back to motorized (steamboat rock), and deal with it from a social impacts perspective.
- LaPine – provide wildlife (mule deer) corridors and have them comply with South County Plan.

Lands Flip Charts

1. Need

- Community control over types of growth
- Recovery of natural resource values (more control with Z-2).
- Costs-mitigation (Z-2, community expansion) not necessarily related
- Greatest money value for lands as well as cooperation with city and county.
- Differences between public purposes other uses that benefit individual.
- State can take “in-lieu” selection lands if needed (DSL). Community expansion (CE) can go to DSL → Z-2 option doesn’t allow this.
- Consider off-site mitigation for R&PP

2. Concerns/topics for discussion

- Z-1 → Z-2: would like something less blanket
- Concern over 500 ft canal buffer\
- Concern over changing from community expansion to Z-2
- Look out for the broader BLM opportunity; Z-2 may give more options for a 3-way purchase/exchange.
- Strict public purpose v. public purpose with the interest (financial from outside) selling land for industry where it’s a legit goal, but maybe BLM doesn’t need to finance it. BLM has a choice for CE needs.
- LaPine: land on east side of railroad for sewer effluent, land next to airport for community needs and public purpose; misc expansion needs.
- Concern over Community expansion in LaPine v. Roslind Play Area.
- Z-2 with a CE emphasis (3rd party exchange as 2nd priority) might be worth talking about (really just a comfort term).

3. Options

- Identify a core block as Z-1, identify areas around this as Z-2 so you can block it up.
- Extend Z-2 to the other side of Millican/W. Butte highway.
- Sawtooth stays the way it is in alt 6, North of hwy 126 goes to CE with no option for open space, plus clarifications for DSL, etc.
- Maintain Alt 6 CE lands; put other “unnecessary” CE lands into Z-2
- Stay with Redmond’s current CE needs

QUESTIONS BROUGHT UP BY LARGER GROUP

- Look to East Fort Rock OHV as an example of trust building within the agency.
- A managed trial system that is “user friendly” has a much higher compliance ratio because it meets the needs better.
- Vermont eco study showed \$56 million in revenue from the snowmobilers in 1 season. Recreationists do spend locally.
- Since we have 2 main concepts of fragmentation and seasonal closures captured, can we develop a guideline that gets at both? Seasonal closure if we can’t meet

habitat effectiveness or if the hab effectiveness falls below a certain type of experience?

- Can we meet outside this meeting?
 - Should we adopt “Fragmentation” concept as a tool?
 - Can we solidify some seasonal closure date options? - Fragmentation and seasonal + 2 weeks would be an option to deal with spring break recreation (instead of 3/15 → 3/31).
-
- Community need vs greater public good; i.e. blocking up public land
 - Clarify that industrial residents are not eligible for R&PP
 - Note DSL requirement
 - Add 3rd party exchanges as a second priority for CE.
 - Offsite mitigation for R&PP.
 - Does Z-2 ensure BLM compatible with adjacent land use to lands retained by BLM?
 - Describe the compatibility w/Roslind OHV area and CE lands in LaPine.
 - What percentage of overall Z-2 lands are being or potentially being allocated for community expansion?
 - How do we look at connectivity of uses after land exchanges?